



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and if it rebounds vertically upward, then

$$\cot \psi = (2n + 1) \tan \varphi.$$

SOLUTION BY IMMANUEL KLAUFF, Chicago, Ill.

The equation of the path is, if we let  $\varphi + \psi = \alpha$ ,

$$y = x \tan \alpha - \frac{gx^2}{2v_0^2 \cos^2 \alpha}.$$

The given inclined plane intersects this parabola at  $P_1$  and the slope of the parabola at  $P_1$  is

$$\left(\frac{dy}{dx}\right)_{P_1} = 2 \tan \varphi - \tan \alpha = \tan \omega.$$

The angle of inclination of the first rebound is

$$\omega_1 + \varphi = \gamma_1.$$

where  $\omega_1$  is the complement of  $\omega$ . We have

$$\tan \gamma_1 = \frac{\tan \omega_1 + \tan \varphi}{1 - \tan \omega_1 \tan \varphi} = \frac{\tan \varphi - \tan \omega}{1 + \tan \omega \tan \varphi} = \frac{\tan \alpha - \tan \varphi}{1 - 2 \tan^2 \varphi + \tan \varphi \tan \varphi} = \frac{\tan \psi}{1 - 2 \tan \psi \tan \varphi}.$$

The analysis for the subsequent rebounds is the same; the angle of projection with respect to the inclined plane is for the  $n$ th rebound

$$\gamma_n = \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{\frac{\tan \psi}{1 - 2(n-1) \tan \psi \tan \varphi}}{1 - \frac{2 \tan \psi \tan \varphi}{1 - 2(n-1) \tan \psi \tan \varphi}} \right] = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\tan \psi}{1 - 2n \tan \psi \tan \varphi} \right).$$

If the ball rebounds vertically, we have

$$\tan (\gamma_n + \varphi) = \infty, \quad \text{or} \quad 1 - \frac{\tan \psi \tan \varphi}{1 - 2n \tan \psi \tan \varphi} = 0.$$

Whence,  $1 - (2n + 1) \tan \psi \tan \varphi = 0$ ; and  $\cot \psi = (2n + 1) \tan \varphi$ .

Also solved by H. S. UHLER, HORACE OLSON, and the PROPOSER.

#### NUMBER THEORY.

##### 185. Proposed by R. D. CARMICHAEL, Bloomington, Indiana.

Obtain the complete solution of the equation  $\phi(p^\alpha) = \phi(q^\beta)$  where  $\phi$  denotes Euler's  $\phi$ -function,  $p$  and  $q$  are unknown primes, and  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are unknown integers.

CRITICISM BY T. H. GRONWALL, New York City.

The solution of this problem on page 227, Volume XX, September, 1913, is open to criticism. From the equation:

$$p^{\alpha-1}(p-1) = q^{\beta-1}(q-1),$$

where  $p$  and  $q$  are primes, and  $p > q$ , it follows that

$$p-1 = \lambda q^{\beta-1}, \quad q-1 = \lambda p^{\alpha-1}$$

where  $\lambda$  is a positive integer. Since  $q < p$ , the second equation shows that  $\alpha = 1$ , and consequently  $\lambda = q-1$ ,

$$p = 1 + (q-1)q^{\beta-1};$$

and here the prime  $q$  and the exponent  $\beta$  have to be chosen so that  $p$  becomes a prime. The error consists in assuming  $\lambda = 1$  and hence  $q = 2$ ; that this does not give all the solutions, is evident from the examples:

$$q = 2, \quad \beta = 2, 3, 5 \\ p = 3, 5, 17$$

$$q = 3, \quad \beta = 2, 3, 5 \\ p = 7, 19, 163$$

$$q = 5, \quad \beta = 3, 5 \\ p = 101, 2501.$$

**214. (April, 1914.) Proposed by A. J. KEMPNER, University of Illinois.**

Let  $a$  be a positive integer  $\geq 2$ , and let  $T(n)$  denote the number of distinct divisors of the positive integer  $n$ , including both 1 and  $n$ , so that  $T(1) = 1$ ,  $T(2) = 2$ ,  $T(3) = 2$ ,  $T(4) = 3$ ,  $\dots$ . Show that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{n=\infty} T(n)/a^n = \sum_{n=1}^{n=\infty} 1/(a^n - 1).$$

The special case  $a = 10$  gives, as is easily seen:

$$9 \sum_{n=1}^{n=\infty} \frac{T(n)}{10^n} = \frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{11} + \frac{1}{111} + \frac{1}{1111} + \dots.$$

**SOLUTION BY FRANK IRWIN, University of California.**

We prove the proposition first for the special case,  $a = 10$ . We have,

$$1/9 = .11111111\dots, \quad 1/99 = .01010101\dots,$$

$$1/999 = .001001001\dots, \quad 1/9999 = .00010001\dots,$$

and so on.

Let us determine the sum of all the digits in the  $n$ th decimal place. Since the  $k$ th row of the above array reads

$$1/99\dots99 = .00\dots00100\dots001\dots,$$

with  $k$  9's on the left and  $(k - 1)$  0's in each recurring period on the right, it follows that we get a 1 in the  $n$ th decimal place whenever  $k$  is a divisor of  $n$ , and otherwise a zero. We have, then,  $T(n)$  units in this place, and since a unit there has the value  $1/10^n$ , their sum is  $T(n)/10^n$ ; and the sum of our series,  $1/9 + 1/99 + 1/999 + \dots$ , is equal to

$$\sum_{n=1}^{n=\infty} T(n)/10^n,$$

as was to be proved.

(It is clear that, regarding the array as a double series, we have a right to put the sum by rows equal to the sum by columns.)

In the general case, where we have any  $a$ , we need merely suppose the decimals above written in the scale of  $a$ , instead of in that of 10,

$$1/(a - 1) = .1111\dots, \quad 1/(a^2 - 1) = .0101\dots, \text{ etc.,}$$

and a like argument holds.

## QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSIONS.

[Send all Communications to U. G. MITCHELL, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.]

### DISCUSSIONS.

#### I. RELATING TO NAPIER'S LOGARITHMIC CONCEPT.

BY H. S. CARSLAW, University of Sydney, Australia.

In the March number of the MONTHLY, page 71, Professor Cajori takes exception to the following remark, contained in a paper of mine in the *Mathematical Gazette* (Vol. VIII, page 77):